IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA MACON DIVISION

QUADRAY HOBBS,

Plaintiff,

V.

NO. 5:22-cv-00434-TES-CHW

CO II WILLIAMS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Pending before the Court are several miscellaneous motions filed by Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se. For the reasons explained below, Plaintiff's motions are without merit.

Motion to Produce Documents

Plaintiff filed a document entitled "Requesting Production of Documents," wherein he asks the Court to produce all documents in the case. (Doc. 11). Plaintiff explains that he needs the documents to prepare for the case and because he is a pro se litigant. (Id.) The docket shows that he has been mailed copies of the Court's orders. Plaintiff does not specify which documents he is requesting. Plaintiff was allowed to proceed in forma pauperis in this matter (Doc. 7), but this status does not entitle Plaintiff to free additional copies of court records, especially through a blanket request for the entire case file. Therefore, Plaintiff's request for production of documents (Doc. 11) is **DENIED**. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to mail Plaintiff a copy of the docket sheet at which point Plaintiff may inquire with the Clerk of Court regarding the costs of copies of any requested documents.

Motion for Appointment of Counsel

In two motions, Plaintiff requests the appointment of counsel. (Docs. 14, 15). No right to

counsel exists in a civil case. Wahl v McIver, 773 F.2d 1169, 1174 (11th Cir. 1986). Rather, the

appointment of counsel is a privilege justified only by exceptional circumstances. Id. In deciding

whether legal counsel should be appointed, the Court considers, among other factors, the merits of

Plaintiff's claims and the complexity of the issues presented. Holt v. Ford, 862 F.2d 850, 853 (11th

Cir. 1989).

In accordance with *Holt*, and upon a review of the record in this case, the Court notes that

a recommendation to dismiss this case is pending because Plaintiff failed to follow the Court's

directions not to file a "shotgun" pleading joining multiple unrelated claims. (Doc. 12). Plaintiff

suggests that this case is complex and that he will be unable to prosecute the case due to his

incarceration. Plaintiff's reasoning is unavailing. Plaintiff has filed several cases with the Court,

one of which has survived the screening process. Plaintiff's motions set forth no basis for why

he is likewise unable to do so here in a case where any likely claims would also involve readily

apparent legal doctrines. As such, Plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel (Docs. 14, 15)

are **DENIED**. Should it later become apparent that legal assistance is required to avoid prejudice

to Plaintiff's rights, then the Court, on its own motion, will consider assisting Plaintiff in securing

legal counsel at that time.

SO ORDERED, this 1st day of June, 2023.

s/ Charles H. Weigle

Charles H. Weigle

United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Hobbs v. Dooly State Prison, 5:22-cv-392-TES-CHW, was dismissed at the screening level. Hobbs v. Wheeler Corr. Facility, 5:22-cv-353-MTT-CHW, was transferred to the Southern District of Georgia.

Hobbs v. Dooly State Prison, 5:22-cv-283-TES-CHW, survived the screening process and remains pending.